

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	09/449,204		SINICROPI ET AL.		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	BJ Forman		1634		

All Participants:

(1) BJ Forman.

(2) Katherine M. Kowalachyk.

Date of Interview: 14 February 2005

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

46 & 47

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


FORMAN, PH.D.
EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted Ms Kowalachyk to discuss possible amendments to place the claims in condition for allowance. The examiner explained that the current rejections are based on the open language "may contain...nuclease" of independent Claims 46 and 47. The examiner suggested replacing "may contain" with "contains" to overcome the cited art because the prior art does not contain nuclease. Ms. Kowalachyk agreed to the amendments. .


R. FORMAN, PH.D.
EXAMINER